U.S. Department of Education - EDCAPS
G5-Technical Review Form (New)

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Aspire Public Schools (U411C110424)
Reader #3:   **********

	Points Possible	**Points Scored**
Questions		
Summary Statement		
Summary Statement		
1. Summary Statement	0	
Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project	35	35
Quality of Project Design		
1. Project Design	25	25
Quality of the Management Plan		
1. Quality of the Management	20	20
Sub Total	80	80
Priority Questions		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
Competitive Preference Priority 6		
1. Competitive Preference 6	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
Competitive Preference Priority 7		
1. Competitive Preference 7	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
Competitive Preference Priority 8		
1. Competitive Preference Pr	1	0
Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
Competitive Preference Priority 9		
1. Competitive Preference 9	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 10		
Competitive Preference Priority 10		

1. Competitive Preference 10		1	1
	Sub Total	1	1
	Total	85	82

Technical Review Form

Reader #3: **********

Applicant: Aspire Public Schools (U411C110424)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. **Summary Statement (Optional)**

   General:

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   (2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

   (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

   Strengths:

   1. The applicant is a non-profit organization which operates public charter schools throughout the State of California. The applicant plans to serve its 12,000 students by increasing the number of highly effective teachers (Absolute Priority 1) through a series of activities and services that include an integrated, easy to use computer system to provide professional development material to all teachers (p. e23). These services address competitive Priorities 9 (Productivity) and 10 (Technology). The applicant seeks to make all students college-ready (p. e24). The applicant is providing a combination of services which is exceptional: Technology support for coaching, customized (p. e25), data driven professional development resources (p. e25), and an integrated recruiting system (p. e26). Teachers will have a system of on-demand videos and other resources.

   2. The applicant indicates that it will not only develop a full range of professional development opportunities and resources, it will maintain an ongoing assessment of what was found to be effective (p. e29). Such resources as lesson plans, videos, and practice lessons will be tracked and measured for use and effectiveness. As a result, the project will create a resource library and close this gap. Another gap identified is how teachers need to improve according to discrete teaching standards (p. e30). As a result, the project will track and asses the effective actions of principals and coaches which others may wish to adopt.

   3. In raising teacher quality, the applicant intends to increase teacher skills, retain highly effective teachers, and target recruitment of new teachers based on data concerning the current effective teacher cadre (pp. e30-e31). By maintaining a data system, the applicant will be able to measure its impact on increasing the number of highly effective teachers and the value of specific professional development programs which impact on

student learning.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: **35**

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

    (1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are
    (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and
    (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

    (2) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

    Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both
    (a) to assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and
    (b) to understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Development grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

    (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

    (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

    Strengths:

    1.a. All three goals offered by the applicant address Absolute Priority 1 (AP1). For example, goal 1 states: Double the number of highly effective teachers in ___ schools from 15% to 30% of our teaching corps (p. e32). The objectives are clear, measurable, and focused on AP1 as well as on the two competitive priorities (9 & 10).

    1.b. In addition to clear goals, the applicant also indicates that it has experience that will enable it to strengthen the link between evaluation and real time professional development tools as well as integrate all the various approaches and systems into one seamless entity to serve the students (p. e32).

    2.a. The applicant reports that it will spend $200 per student in the start up of the program and will have an ongoing operating cost of $17 per student (p. e34). The applicant provides extensive information.

2.b. For 100,000 students, the applicant estimates a cost of $2.88 million (p. e36).   For 250,000 students, the cost is $6.75 million. The cost estimated for 500,000 students is $12 million.

3.   The applicant provides very detailed budget information (p. e36 and pp. e172ff). The applicant provides reasonable cost estimates and then adjusts them to eliminate start-up costs in subsequent years.

4. The applicant indicates that it is in its organizational approach to develop innovative efforts, use them in their schools, and then disseminate them to others (p. e37). The applicant is committed to sharing what it has learned in the project and sharing the results with others interested in adopting the models.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 25

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

1. The applicant offers a management plan which includes a steering committee, a program management structure headed by a project director, and a technology advisory committee (p. e43). This plan is supplemented with charts and tables which integrates the management and evaluation plans (p.e45). In addition, the applicant aligned management procedures with each of the goals over the four years of the project (p. e46). The information reflects excellent planning and will enable the applicant to sustain the project and scale up as appropriate.

2.   The applicant identifies the key positions and personnel for the project. Their roles are aligned with the goals of the project (p. e47). In both the narrative (p. e48) and resumes (pp. w82ff), the staff describes the qualifications and experiences of the personnel. For example, the project director holds an MS degree, has served as a director of technology in a $4 million project, and has extensive involvement in technology (pp. e82-e83). The information for the project director and other personnel is appropriate and will assist in reaching the goals of the project.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

   (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

   (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

   (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

   Strengths:

   The applicant did not apply for this priority.

   Weaknesses:

   The applicant did not apply for this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

   (a) address students'preparedness and expectations related to college;

   (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

   (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

   Strengths:

   The applicant did not apply for this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply for this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

The applicant did not apply for this priority.

Weaknesses:

The applicant did not apply for this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The applicant provides services and activities which will increase the number of highly effective teachers who will have a direct impact on student achievement through an improved professional development program.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)

We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

The applicant plans to use technology to do coaching, create an online resource library, and conduct teacher recruitment.

Weaknesses:

No weaknesses found.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/9/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Aspire Public Schools (U411C110424)
Reader #1:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Summary Statement			
Summary Statement			
1. Summary Statement		0	
	Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need for Project		35	35
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	22
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	20
	Sub Total	80	77
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
1. Competitive Preference 6		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
1. Competitive Preference 7		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	0
	Sub Total	1	0
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
1. Competitive Preference 9		1	1
	Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 10			
Competitive Preference Priority 10			

1. Competitive Preference 10		1	1
	Sub Total	1	1
	Total	85	79

Technical Review Form

Reader #1:   * * * * * * * * * *

Applicant: Aspire Public Schools (U411C110424)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. **Summary Statement (Optional)**

   General:

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   (2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

   (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

   Strengths:

The proposal's overall goal of making teacher observations and evaluations more valuable by collecting real-time data is unique and related to the absolute priority of improving teaching effectiveness. (p. 2). The proposal would be applied to schools where the majority of students are low income students/minority students (75% are low income, while 80% are minority) (p. 2). While Aspire has already worked to create strong teaching standards and summative assessments on teachers, a gap has still existed on creating professional development that constantly addresses teacher needs (p. 6). By creating large amounts of data on teachers, and then using this data to help create a library of professional development clips and data that demonstrate strong teaching, Aspire aims to not only create more effective teachers, but also find a means to increasing teacher satisfaction (ideally leading to higher teacher retention) (p. 8). The organization also hopes to use the data to help focus on the traits that help create a strong teacher, and then use those traits in the hiring process to make sure the best teachers are hired for the organization.

   Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this area.

   Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are
   (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and
   (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

   (2) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

   Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both
   (a) to assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and
   (b) to understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Development grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

   (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

   (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

   Strengths:

   The proposal has three clearly defined goals that are all quantifiable - double the number of highly effective teachers, cut in half the turnover percentage and cut in half the number of first year teachers who rank in the bottom half of the district (p. 10). The budget appears to be reasonable given the large amount of new technology that would be used to create the t3 program. However, the proposal notes that scaling the project to larger districts would be much cheaper than the original start up costs as Aspire would be able to offer licensing of its products to other districts and schools as opposed to having the schools recreate their own electronic evaluation systems. (p. 13)

   Weaknesses:

   While the goals of the application are clearly defined and tie to the overall priority of teacher effectiveness, the proposal does not make any connections to increasing student achievement (p. 3-9).

Reader's Score: 22

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

(2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

Strengths:

The management plan includes a team approach that will work with all aspects of the project. This includes creating a Steering Committee to focus on strategy and scope of the project, and a Technology Advisory Board that will work with the unique technology aspects of the project. The management plan timeline is well laid out and easy to follow. The plan is broken down into two clear parts - the actions of the proposal and when they should be occurring and the staffing of the program - who is responsible for the numerous actions (p. 23-25).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 20

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

   (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

   (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

   (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

   Strengths:

   The application does not address this priority

   Weaknesses:

   The application does not address this priority

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

   (a) address students'preparedness and expectations related to college;

   (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

   (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

   Strengths:

   The application does not address this priority.

   Weaknesses:

   The application does not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

   Strengths:

   The application does not address this priority.

   Weaknesses:

   The application does not address this priority.

Reader's Score: 0

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase

efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

Strengths:

The application hopes to introduce and create a t3 tool which will provide quicker feedback to teachers on their observations and their overall teaching (p. 2). This tool will instantly show teachers where their strengths and weaknesses are in relation to the teaching standards. It will also save teachers valuable time in getting the feedback right away (as opposed to waiting for a write up, then conferencing, then getting suggestions on support).

Weaknesses:

There are no weaknesses in this area.

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

Strengths:

The application includes the creation and implementation of new technology to improve teacher effectiveness. First, it hopes to create a tool so that principals or other instructional leaders can provide real time observation commentary and support to teachers (p. 1) Second, they hope to create a searchable library of PD videos so that teachers will easily be recommended different videos to watch based upon their areas of growth found in the observations (p. 1)Both of these ideas are innovative and, when completed, should impact teacher effectiveness

Weaknesses:

There are no weakness in this area.

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/11/11 12:00 AM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Aspire Public Schools (U411C110424)
Reader #2:   **********

		Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions			
Summary Statement			
Summary Statement			
1. Summary Statement		0	
	Sub Total	0	
Selection Criteria			
Need for Project			
1. Need for Project		35	35
Quality of Project Design			
1. Project Design		25	23
Quality of the Management Plan			
1. Quality of the Management		20	19
	Sub Total	80	77
Priority Questions			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
Competitive Preference Priority 6			
1. Competitive Preference 6		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
Competitive Preference Priority 7			
1. Competitive Preference 7		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
Competitive Preference Priority 8			
1. Competitive Preference Pr		1	
	Sub Total	1	
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
Competitive Preference Priority 9			
1. Competitive Preference 9		1	1
	Sub Total	1	1
Competitive Preference Priority 10			
Competitive Preference Priority 10			

1. Competitive Preference 10	1	1
Sub Total	1	1
Total	85	79

Technical Review Form

Reader #2:   * * * * * * * * * *

Applicant: Aspire Public Schools (U411C110424)

Questions

Summary Statement - Summary Statement

1. **Summary Statement (Optional)**

   General:

   Reader's Score:

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1. **The Secretary considers the need for the project. In determining the need for the project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The extent to which the proposed project represents an exceptional approach to the priority or priorities established for the competition.

   (2) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses.

   (3) The extent to which the eligible applicant demonstrates that, if funded, the proposed project likely will have a positive impact, as measured by the importance or magnitude of the effect, on improving student achievement or student growth, closing achievement gaps, decreasing dropout rates, increasing high school graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment and completion rates.

   Strengths:

   The proposal is for 34 schools across the state of California, which could be useful for replication in other schools. The schools serve a high percentage of low-income and minority students.

   Aspire has identified gaps in its annual teacher evaluation system and proposes the t3 system to remedy them. Specifically, it provides real-time feedback to inform classroom practice throughout the year. It is also connecting the system to its teacher recruitment efforts. Data regarding these gaps are provided in the appendices.

   The proposal is an exceptional approach to using technology to mine data for the purpose of individualizing professional development and improving instruction.

   The proposal describes multiple mechanisms that will lead to improved student achievement: teacher efficacy, retention, and recruitment.

Weaknesses:

no weaknesses

Reader's Score: 35

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Design

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the design to be conducted of the proposed project. In determining the quality of the project design, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

 (1) The extent to which the proposed project has a clear set of goals and an explicit strategy, with actions that are (a) aligned with the priorities the eligible applicant is seeking to meet, and (b) expected to result in achieving the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project.

 (2) The eligible applicant's estimate of the cost of the proposed project, which includes the start up and operating costs per student per year (including indirect costs) for reaching the total number of students proposed to be served by the project. The eligible applicant must include an estimate of the costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students.

 Note: The Secretary considers cost estimates both (a) to assess the reasonableness of the costs relative to the objectives, design, and potential significance for the total number of students to be served by the proposed project, which is determined by the eligible applicant, and (b) to understand the possible costs for the eligible applicant or others (including other partners) to reach the scaling targets of 100,000, 250,000, and 500,000 students for Development grants. An eligible applicant is free to propose how many students it will serve under its project, and is expected to reach that number of students by the end of the grant period. The scaling targets, in contrast, are theoretical and allow peer reviewers to assess the cost-effectiveness generally of proposed projects, particularly in cases where initial investment may be required to support projects that operate at reduced cost in the future, whether implemented by the eligible applicant or any other entity. Grantees are not required to reach these numbers during the grant period.

 (3) The extent to which the costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives, design, and potential significance of the proposed project.

 (4) The potential and planning for the incorporation of project purposes, activities, or benefits into the ongoing work of the eligible applicant and any other partners at the end of the Development grant.

 Strengths:

 The proposal has clear and measurable goals, including student achievement, teacher turnover, and teacher performance. The evaluation notes that achievement will be disaggregated by subgroups.

 The goal of 85% of new teachers rank above average based on student growth percentiles is ambituous.

 The project has clear and connected components, including systems for teacher observation, coaching and individualize professional development resources.

 Aspire has already begun developing many of the resources required to make the project work. E33

 Aspire has developed infrastructure to disseminate its tools and resources. E33

 The costs seem reasonable given the initial start-up and development costs that decline in future years and would be relatively low if replicated once the system is refined. E35 The proposal has given some thought to the various costs to other districts or CMOs.

Weaknesses:

It is not evident that getting from 15% to 30% of teachers achieving at least 1.1 years of growth for at-risk students is ambitious considering the gap low-income students often face.

Reader's Score: 23

Selection Criteria - Quality of the Management Plan

1. **The Secretary considers the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project. In determining the quality of the management plan and personnel for the proposed project, the Secretary considers the following factors:**

   (1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks, as well as tasks related to the sustainability and scalability of the proposed project.

   (2) The qualifications, including relevant training and experience, of the project director and key project personnel, especially in managing projects of the size and scope of the proposed project.

   Strengths:

   The proposal includes a detailed work plan that addresses all components of the project described in the narrative.

   The Godzilla team appears to have the expertise to implement the proposed project.

   Weaknesses:

   It is not clear what v1 and v2 are in the timeline (I assume different versions of tools)

Reader's Score: 19

Priority Questions

Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Competitive Preference Priority 6

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 6 - Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (birth through 3rd grade) by enhancing the quality of early learning programs. To meet this priority, applications must focus on

   (a) improving young children's school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive readiness) so that children are prepared for success in core academic subjects (as defined in section 9101(11) of the ESEA);

   (b) improving developmental milestones and standards and aligning them with appropriate outcome measures; and

   (c) improving alignment, collaboration, and transitions between early learning programs that serve children from birth to age three, in preschools, and in kindergarten through third grade.

Strengths:

Applicant did not apply for this preference

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Competitive Preference Priority 7

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 7 - Innovations that Support College Access and Success (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to enable kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12) students, particularly high school students, to successfully prepare for, enter, and graduate from a two- or four-year college. To meet this priority, applications must include practices, strategies, or programs for K-12 students that

   (a) address students'preparedness and expectations related to college;

   (b) help students understand issues of college affordability and the financial aid and college application processes; and

   (c) provide support to students from peers and knowledgeable adults.

   Strengths:

   Applicant did not apply for this preference

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Competitive Preference Priority 8

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 8 - Innovations to Address the Unique Learning Needs of Students with Disabilities and Limited English Proficient Students (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that would implement innovative practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to address the unique learning needs of students with disabilities, including those who are assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards, or the linguistic and academic needs of limited English proficient students. To meet this priority, applications must provide for the implementation of particular practices, strategies, or programs that are designed to improve academic outcomes, close achievement gaps, and increase college- and career-readiness, including increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), for students with disabilities or limited English proficient students.

Strengths:

Applicant did not apply for this preference

Weaknesses:

Reader's Score:

Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Competitive Preference Priority 9

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 9 - Improving Productivity (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to significantly increase efficiency in the use of time, staff, money, or other resources while improving student learning or other educational outcomes (i.e., outcome per unit of resource). Such projects may include innovative and sustainable uses of technology, modification of school schedules and teacher compensation systems, use of open educational resources (as defined in this notice), or other strategies.

   Strengths:

   The proposal focuses in more efficient use of time and productive use of data to drive to professional development and improve instruction.

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Competitive Preference Priority 10

1. **Competitive Preference Priority 10 - Technology (zero or one point)**

   We give competitive preference to applications for projects that are designed to improve student achievement or teacher effectiveness through the use of high-quality digital tools or materials, which may include preparing teachers to use the technology to improve instruction, as well as developing, implementing, or evaluating digital tools or materials.

   Strengths:

   The use of technology is central to the proposal; it connects student and teacher data to drive professional development directly tied to practice in the classroom.

   Weaknesses:

Reader's Score: 1

Status: Submitted

Last Updated: 9/12/11 12:00 AM